DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 981 CG 023 802

AUTHOR Yarris, Elizabeth
TITLE Sexual Intimacy in Training and Practice: Setting Limits for Counselors, Psychologists and Educators.
PUB DATE 30 Mar 89
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Student Personnel Association (Washington, DC, March 29-April 1, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Counseling; *Counselor Attitudes; *Counselor Client Relationship; Counselor Educators; Counselors; Counselor Training; Ethics; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Intimacy; Psychologists; *Sexuality
IDENTIFIERS American College Personnel Association; *Dual Relationships

ABSTRACT

The September 1988 newsletter of Commission VII (Counseling and Psychological Services) of the American College Personnel Association contained a survey addressing the issues of sexual intimacy in the training and practice of counselors, psychologists and educators. Approximately 800 surveys were mailed to the commission members. Participation in the survey was voluntary and anonymous. A total of 75 questionnaires were returned from 30 states. The most useful information from this survey is that which suggests a lack of awareness and training in some specific areas. One cause for concern is the number of therapists and clients who believe that social relationships during therapy or after termination are acceptable. The second major concern is the lack of training reported concerning dual relationships and erotic transference and countertransference. Finally, it appears that there is still much uncertainty concerning the propriety of social and romantic relationships between educators and students and supervisors and supervisees. This is disturbing due to reports that such relationships are harmful to the students and may even model future inappropriate sexual behavior with clients or students. Although the data resulting from the current survey are limited due to the low return rate, the comments of the respondents should be cause for reflection on the training and examples of behavior that are provided in college and university counseling centers. Thirty references, 10 graphs, and the survey form are provided. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED388981

Sexual Intimacy in Training and Practice:

Setting Limits for Counselors, Psychologists and Educators

Elizabeth Yarris

Bowling Green State University

CG023802

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American College Student Personnel Association, March 30, 1989, Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elizabeth Yarris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sexual Intimacy in Training and Practice:

Setting Limits for Counselors, Psychologists and Educators

Surveys of Psychiatrists (Gartrell, Herman, Olarte, Feldstein & Localio, 1986), licensed psychologists in California (Bouhoutsos, Holroyd, Lerman, Forer & Greenberg, 1983), licensed Ph.D. psychologists (Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977), members of the Divisions of Private Practice (Pope, Keith-Spiegel & Tabachnick, 1986) and of Psychotherapy (Pope, Levenson & Schover, 1979) of the American Psychological Association reveal that between .6 and 3.1% of female therapists and 4.8 to 12.1% of male therapists self-reported sexual contact with clients. Sexual contact between therapist and client consistently has resulted in much more harm than benefit to client (Grunebaum, 1986; Nathan, Thoreson & Kilburg, 1983; Pope, 1988; Taylor & Wagner, 1976; Zelen, 1985) and has also resulted in problems for the therapist (Butler & Zelen, 1977; Keith- Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Pope et al., 1986; Zelen, 1985). Legal and ethical complaints of sexual impropriety filed against psychologists have increased greatly, extending to violations which occurred after termination of the therapeutic relationship (Ethics Committee of the American Psychological Association, 1988; Gottlieb, Sell & Schoenfeld, 1988; Sell, Gottlieb & Schoenfeld, 1986). There is evidence that the inappropriate therapist/client sexual intimacy may be modeled by previous inappropriate educator/student relationships (Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985) and that training and supervision and consultation for ethical and sexual issues is lacking in graduate programs (Birk & Brooks, 1986; Bouhoutsos, 1985; Graham, Rawlings, Halpern & Herns, 1984; Gartrell et al., 1986; Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977; Pope, Shover & Levenson, 1980; Pope et al., 1986).

None of the above information has been collected in a college or university counseling center setting. The purposes of this paper are 1) to raise awareness of the harmful consequences of inappropriate intimacy and of the lack of training which is necessary to prevent its occurrence 2) to report the results of a survey of the membership of Commission VII on sexual intimacy (educator/student; therapist/client; training received) 3) to discuss the results and their implications and 4) to elicit audience suggestions for actions plans which are appropriate to improve training and practice in setting limits on inappropriate sexual intimacy.

Method

The September 1988 newsletter of Commission VII (Counseling and Psychological Services) of the American College Personnel Association contained a survey addressing the issues of sexual intimacy in the training and practice of counselors, psychologists and educators. Approximately 800 surveys were mailed to the commission members. A copy of the questionnaire is attached. Participation in the survey was

voluntary and anonymous and approval was obtained from the appropriate Human Subjects Review Board prior to the distribution of the questionnaire.

Results

A total of 75 questionnaires were returned from a total of 30 states. All areas of the country were represented with the fewest returns from the west coast. The return rate of approximately 9.4% greatly limits the usefulness and generalizability of the data obtained. Although one published report (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983) had a return rate of 16% from licensed psychologists in the state of California, most of the literature which focuses on inappropriate sexual intimacy report return rates between 33 and 70% (Pope, 1988). Speculation concerning the low return rate of the present survey includes the sensitive nature of the subject and the fact that the design of the survey made it difficult to complete.

Due to the limitations inherent in the low return and the fact that not all questions were answered for each survey, data will be reported in a descriptive manner only. Inferences cannot be justified. Although the numbers to be reported have some value the most useful results come from the personal comments of the participants.

Descriptive Data

The mean age of the respondents was 40.21 with a median of 38 and a range of 25 through 67. They included 38 (50.7%) females and 36 (48%) males (one did not note gender; in this and in other categories percentages may not total 100 due to missing data). The majority indicate having the Ph.D. (56%) or Ed.D. (10.67%). Master's degrees were held by 32% and one individual (1.3%) reported a bachelor's degree but is currently in a doctoral program. In describing field the following responses were given: Counseling Psychology, 36%; Counseling or Counseling and Guidance, 28%; Psychology, 12%; College Student Personnel, 9.3%; Clinical Psychology, 5.3% and other fields, 9.3%. More than half (66.7%) reported being licensed or certified. This information is summarized in Table 1. A total of 63 (84%) were currently involved with a college or university counseling center: staff, 45%; administrators, 29%, clients, 0.05%; and practicum students, 0.04%. None of the respondents indicated that they were currently interns. Past and present counseling center experience is summarized in Table 2.

In comparing this sample of respondents with a previous (May, 1985) survey of Commission VII members (N = 101), there are similarities in response rate, age and education. The current sample consists of more individuals who identify themselves as a type of psychologist other than Counseling Psychologist (18.7% vs. 8.8%), fewer counseling center administrators (29% vs. 41 %) and more women (50.7 % vs. 39.8%).

Training which was received regarding dual relationships is reported in Tables 3-5. Although not everyone will define some of the listed relationships as "dual" (if the two individuals are not currently in

the position where one has evaluative power over the other), all of these relationships have the possibility of being dual relationships. As students, more than 50% of the respondents received training concerning social and sexual relationships with clients which might occur during therapy or after termination. None of the other categories of training concerning dual relationships reached the 50% level. In fact, in 20 out of 24 remaining categories less then 30% reported training as students, interns or counseling center staff on relationships between teachers and students, supervisors and supervisees or therapists and clients.

Training received regarding issues of erotic transferences and countertransference is reported in Table 6. Less than 50% of all respondents reported some training concerning erotic transference and countertransference.

Tables 7-10 report the number and percentages of those respondents who indicated that they had had social, romantic, or sexual relationships with individuals whom they had met through professional or academic settings. The most frequently reported relationship was that labeled "social". However, less than 50% reported any social dual relationships. Romantic or sexual relationships were reported infrequently. Romantic relationships with higher status colleagues was reported most frequently in those categories (6.67%).

Regarding relationships with clients, 21.33% indicated that as counseling center staff they had had social relationships with clients either during therapy or after termination. Two male and one female respondents reported romantic attraction either toward or from a client. An additional two male respondents indicated they had engaged in erotic touching with a client. Relationships which resulted in sexual intercourse with clients were reported by one male and one female as counseling center staff. One of the relationships had begun prior to termination of therapy.

While a client at a counseling center, 12% of the respondents indicated that they had had social relationships with their therapist either during therapy or after termination. Two respondents, both female, indicated that while they were counseling center clients they had been erotically touched or had had sexual intercourse with their therapists.

Personal Comments

A total of 44 respondents made open-ended comments concerning their training in issues of sexual intimacy between therapist and client or educator and student. Over half of these stated very clearly that they did not receive sufficient training. One person commented, "I received woefully little training in this area." Although this individual listed his age as 29, many of those who received their training in the 1960s and 1970s thought that more training is being provided currently. The comments do not support that assumption. A number of respondents stated that what they had learned had to come from their own initiative in attending workshops, reading or discussing issues with supervisors. There were complaints of lack of depth in training, in the focus on the rules rather than on the process of making ethical decisions, and of the inappropriate modeling of unethical behavior by faculty. Some noted that they felt

confused about issues of dual relationships for some time after their initial training and one stated "it gets clarified only when obviously raised by the client." One individual stated that working with clients who had had previous sexual relationships with therapists had increased his interest in the topic. One respondent noted that training in these areas used to focus on the male as the perpetrator of inappropriate sexual relationships and reminded us that training needs to consider women also.

Concerning a lack of training on erotic countertransference, one individual stated "I think in graduate school, I somehow had the impression that to experience sexual feelings toward clients was illicit, or my problem. Now I view this as more of a diagnostic indicator in a therapeutic relationship."

In regard to social relationships between students and faculty or between supervisees and supervisors most of the respondents who had such relationships stated that they saw these relationships as important for academic and clinical training, often citing the value of mentoring. Most indicated that they saw nothing unethical and did not see the need to seek consultation. At least one respondent sought consultation to discuss the possibility of becoming friends with a post-doctoral supervisee and one indicated that close friendships in the counseling center can be disruptive causing "triangulation."

Comments concerning social relationships between therapists and clients were more varied. Some indicated that on small campuses or in training centers where people served many roles it was difficult not to have minimal social contact with some present or former clients (or therapists). Some respondents indicated that they saw no harm in social relationships with clients, citing the strengthening of the relationships. Others were more ambivalent and stated that they would have contact with a client only following termination or that they were uncomfortable and/or sought consultation. Respondents who did not indicate social relationships with clients usually did not comment, but those who chose to comment usually stated that they believed such relationships to be unethical.

Those who had indicated a romantic attraction to or from a client stated that they sought consultation or therapy. The respondents who had engaged soley in erotic touching with clients noted that the episodes had taken place prior to advance training and awareness of these issues. The therapists who had had sexual intercourse with clients reported seeking consultation or therapy and also that the relationships are current. Neither noted any harm to the client although one (where the initial contact took place some years ago) acknowledged that there was potential danger to the client.

Counseling center clients among the respondents who have had sexual experiences with their therapists hold a different view. One stated "...at the time I thought it was OK--even nice--now I realize that it has had great negative consequences for me. I was truly used and I feel like an idiot. My therapist (male) received the benefits. I received the damages." Another stated "As an undergraduate student I had no awareness of the inappropriateness of the therapist's behavior." Both of these individuals sought consultation or therapy. Another female respondent described her experiences with the erotic touching of a therapist who was not in a college counseling center. She reported feeling violated and feeling severe pain.

More comments were received concerning **academic or supervisory relationships** since more of these were acknowledged than those between therapist and client. Two respondents comment on their relationships with students (whom they were not supervising) while counseling center staff members. Both acknowledged some positive aspects to the experiences but also concern about the power differential. One person sought consultation and in retrospect has regret for not being more aware of the developmental differences between a staff member and a student.

A variety of comments were made by supervisees concerning relationships with therapy supervisors:

> As an intern, a supervisor made overtures and kissed me once. I was confused, set boundaries and remained "friends". Am still angry. I experienced confusion and believe damage occurred, i.e., lack of trust, discomfort. I did not seek consultation (because people believed it was "sort of" common.)
>
> Then the relationship was exciting. Now, some embarrassment...Initially minor benefits. Some long term damage ameliorated by therapy.
>
> At the time I wished that my supervisors were not attracted to me as it added a "touchy" issue to the supervisory relationship.

Concerning a romantic (but not physically intimate) relationship with a therapy supervisor as a graduate student and intern:

> There were no damages involved, because the relationships occurred at the very end of the working situation or after it was terminated. I came to see myself being accepted more and more as a professional (cited as a benefit). The consultation I sought was from another supervisor whom I trusted or from my advisor. Much of it was normalizing my feelings and exploring ways to deal with them so they would not interfere with my ability to work with the person.
>
> The one relationship I think back on as unethical was a sexual relationship with my clinical supervisor during...When we identified the feelings we consulted with other psychologists who said as long as we remained honest and objective the supervisory relationship could continue along with a romance. (early 70s) (The effect) was it hampered a love relationship that might have done better if we terminated the supervision.

The largest number of comments were made concerning relationships with advisors or instructors:

Concerning a proposal of involvement with implications of "benefits" from an instructor as an undergraduate:

> Now I am still amazed and amused but much more angry.

Concerning the homosexual advances by a professor as an undergraduate:

> It frightened and disillusioned me. I would handle it with more confidence now. (After consultation with another professor) I felt reassured that my reaction and subsequent behaviors were inappropriate.

Concerning sexual relationships with undergraduate and graduate instructors:

> At the time I was flattered, nurtured the relationship and saw little wrong with it. I now question why I did it...it was not beneficial or damaging...These relationships were by mutual agreement and I did not feel coerced nor harassed.
>
> The (relationships) were entered into with apprehension but naivete re: the degree of systemic conflict that they would generate. I am much more careful about boundaries now. ...I think I wanted someone to tell me "Don't do it" but no one did. In fact, many people were encouraging.
>
> The most destructive relationship...an undergraduate psychology faculty...my mentor, made sexual advances during my 4th year. Very upsetting. Felt powerless. I still view it as destructive.
>
> I was very honored to have my advisor take an interest in me. It was a pretty mature relationship...We remain good friends... and good colleagues. We have published and presented together...At this time students often dated faculty. I didn't realize how potentially harmful it was.

One individual (who noted that she is not a member of Commission VII) wrote at length concerning the "frightening and abhorrent" experience of having an advisor and supervisor approach her sexually. She noted that she has lost much time, energy and comfort within the department. She feels lonely and embarrassed. She reported benefits as being able to empathize with victims of abuse and the new-found strength she is gaining from therapy.

Overall, many of the comments concerning sexual, romantic and even social relationships had the theme "I wish I had done things differently."

Discussion

The limitations of these data have already been emphasized. The low return rate along with the many different categories surveyed make inferences questionable. If we were to compare the results with other surveys of therapists' sexual involvement with clients, the membership of Commission VII of the American College Personnel Association reports fewer such relationships. Commission VII members also report fewer sexual contacts between educators and students. Perhaps inappropriate relationships are declining or less frequently reported due to current awareness (Pope, 1988). The comments of those who have engaged in such relationships in general range from discomfort to a variety of the symptoms

described by Pope (1988) as the Therapist-Patient Sex Syndrome. However, some report no harm and even cite benefits.

The most useful information from this survey is that which suggests a lack of awareness and training in some specific areas. One cause for concern is the number of therapists (and clients) who believe that social relationships during therapy of after termination are acceptable. Current legal and ethical thinking does not agree (e.g., Gottlieb et al., 1988; Kitchener, 1988; Sell et al., 1986).

The second major concern is the lack of training reported concerning dual relationships and erotic transference and countertransference. Although these results are consistent with previous reports (Pope et al., 1986) that is no excuse to allow this lack of training to continue. Many useful materials are now available to improve the depth and extent of training on these issues (e.g., Hotelling, 1988; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Kitchener, 1988; Vasquez, 1988; Yarris & Allgeier, 1988).

Finally, it appears that there is still much uncertainty concerning the propriety of social and romantic relationships between educators and students and supervisors and supervisees. This is disturbing due to reports that such relationships are harmful to the students (e.g., Glaser & Thorpe, 1986) and may even model future inappropriate sexual behavior with clients or students (Pope et al., 1979). Students may view the relationship as positive at the time (see comments above) but later in life become aware of the damage (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Robinson & Reid, 1985). Essentially students believe that they can give "informed consent" and ignore or deny the power differential. Some students object to being told that they have lower status and therefore cannot freely give informed consent (Gerard, 1981, as reported in Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985). An example of the movement to treat such "consenting relationships" with extreme caution is the Sexual Harassment Policy of the University of Minnesota.

> As revised in 1984, the policy is a strong statement against sexual harassment, which is broadly defined to include behavior that may not be considered overtly sexual. Although not specifically prohibited, consenting sexual relationships between faculty and student or supervisor and employee are actively discouraged.
>
> ...a faculty member who enters into a sexual relationship with a student where a professional power differential exists, must realize that if a charge of sexual harassment is subsequently lodged, it will be exceedingly difficult to prove immunity on grounds of mutual consent. (University of Minnesota, 1984).

Although the data resulting from the current survey are limited due to the low return rate, the comments of the respondents should cause us to reflect on the training and examples which we provide in our college and university counseling centers.

References

Akamatsu, T. J. (1988). Intimate relationships with former clients: National survey of attitudes and behavior among practitioners. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19, 454-458.

Birk, J. M. & Brooks, L. (1986). Required skills and training needs of recent counseling psychology graduates. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 320-325.

Bouhoutsos, J. C. (1985). Therapist-client sexual involvement: A challenge for mental health professionals and educators. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55, 177-182.

Bouhoutsos, J., Holroyd, J., Lerman, H., Forer, B., & Greenberg, M. (1983). Sexual intimacy between psychotherapists and patients. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14, 185-196.

Butler, S. & Zelen, S. L. (1977). Sexual intimacies between therapists and patients. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 14, 139-145.

Ethics Committee of the American Psychological Association. (1988). Trends in ethics cases, common pitfalls, and published resources. American Psychologist, 43, 564-572.

Gartrell, N., Herman, J., Olarte, S., Feldstein, M., & Localio, R. (1986). Psychiatrist-patient sexual contact: Results of a national survey, I. Prevalence. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1986, 143, 1126-1131.

Gerard, S. (1981, April). Attitudes of students toward sexual relations between students and professor. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association meeting, Los Angeles, CA (as reorted in Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1983).

Glaser, R. D. & Thorpe, J. S. (1986). Unethical intimacy: A survey of sexual contact and advances between psychology educators and female graduate students. American Psychologist, 41, 43-51.

Gottlieb, M. C., Sell, J. M., & Schoenfeld, L. S. (1988). Social/romantic relationships with present and former clients: State licensing board actions. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19, 459-462.

Graham, D. L. R., Rawlings, E. I., Halpern, H. S., & Hermes, J. (1984). Therapists' needs for training and counseling lesbians and gay men. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 15, 482-496.

Grunebaum, H. (1986). Harmful psychotherapy experiences. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 40, 165-176.

Holroyd, J. C., & Brodsky, A. M. (1977). Psychologist's attitudes and practices regarding erotic and nonerotic physical contact with patients. American Psychologist, 32, 843-849.

Hotelling, K. (1988). Ethical, legal, and administrative options to address sexual relationships between counselor and client. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 233-237.

Keith-Spiegel, P. & Koocher, G. P. (1985). Ethics in psychology: Standards and cases. New York: Random House.

Kitchener, K. S. (1988). Dual role relationships: What makes them so problematic? Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 217-221.

May, R. (1985). American College Personnel Association Commission VII Survey.

Nathan, P., Thoreson, R., & Kilburg, R. (1983). Board of Professional Affairs Steering Committee on Distressed Psychologists: Draft Report. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pope, K., Keith-Spiegel, P., & Tabachnick, B. G. (1986). Sexual attraction to clients: The human therapist and the (sometimes) inhuman training system. American Psychologist, 41, 147-158.

Pope, K. S. (1988). How clients are harmed by sexual contact with mental health professionals: The syndrome and its prevalence. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 222-226.

Pope, K. S., Levenson, H., & Schover, L. R. (1979). Sexual intimacy in psychology training: Results and implications of a national survey. American Psychologist, 34, 682-689.

Pope, K. S., Schover, L. R., & Levenson, H. (1980). Sexual behavior between clinical supervisors and trainees: Implications for professional standards. Professional Psychology, 11, 157-162.

Robinson, W. L. & Reid, P. T. (1985). Sexual intimacies in psychology revisited. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16, 512-520.

Schoener, G. R., & Gonsiorek, J. (1988). Assessment and development of rehabilitation plans for counselors who have sexually exploited their clients. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 227-232.

Sell, J. M., Gottlieb, M. C., & Schoenfeld, L. (1986). Ethical considerations of social/romantic relationships with present and former clients. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 17, 504-508.

Taylor, B. J., & Wagner, N. N. (1976). Sex between therapists and clients: A review and analysis. Professional Psychology, 7, 593-601.

University of Minnesota. (1984). Sexual Harassment.

Vasquez, M. (1988). Counselor-client sexual contact: Implications for ethics training. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 238-241.

Yarris, E., & Allgeier, E. R. (1988). Sexual socialization for therapists: Applications for the counseling/psychotherapy of women. Women and Therapy, 7, 57-75.

Zelen, S. L. (1985). Sexualization of therapeutic relationships. The dual vulnerability of patient and therapist. Psychotherapy, 22, 178-185.

Author Notes

I thank Kim Durbin for her assistance in word processing and Lynda Sutak for assistance in tabulation of data.

TABLE 1

Sample Description

	n	%
Questionnaires		
Mailed	c.800	
Returned	75	9.37
Gender		
Female	38	50.7
Male	36	48.0
Degree		
Ph.D.	42	56.00
Ed.D.	8	10.67
Master's	24	32.00
Bachelor's	1	1.30
Field		
Counseling Psychology	27	36.00
Counseling or Counseling and Guidance	21	28.00
Psychology	9	12.00
College Student Personnel	7	9.30
Clinical Psychology	4	5.30
Other	7	9.30
Licensed or Certified		
Yes	50	66.70
No	24	32.00

Age

M	40.21
Mdn	38.00
Range	25-67

TABLE 2

Counseling Center Experience

	n	%	M	Mdn
		Present		
Practicum Student	3	.04		
Intern	0			
Staff	34	45.00	7.30	4.25
Administrator	22	29.33	3.63	2.00
Client	4	.05		
		Past		
Practicum Student	58	77.33	1.08	.75
Intern	44	58.67	1.04	1.00
Staff	31	41.33	5.27	4.25
Administrator	16	21.33	4.30	4.25
Client	29	38.67	1.35	0.83

Note: Means and medians are reported in years. Descriptive statistics are not included for small ns.

TABLE 3

Training Received as a Student Regarding Dual Relationships

	Type of Relationship		
	Social	Sexual	Social/Sexual After Termination
Therapist & Client			
n	48	56	40
%	64.00	74.67	53.33
Teacher & Student			
n	18	24	13
%	24.00	32.00	17.33
Supervisor & Supervisee			
n	19	23	11
%	25.33	30.67	14.67

Note: The percentage reflects those out of the entire sample of 75 who indicated training received in these categories.

TABLE 4

Training Received as a Intern Regarding Dual Relationships

	Type of Relationship		
	Social	Sexual	Social/Sexual After Termination
Therapist & Client			
n	23	26	21
%	30.67	34.67	28.00
Teacher & Student			
n	5	6	4
%	6.67	8.00	5.33
Supervisor & Supervisee			
n	9	11	7
%	12.00	14.67	9.33

Note: The percentage reflects those out of the entire sample of 75 who indicated training received in these categories.

TABLE 5

Training Received as a Counseling Center Staff Member Regarding Dual Relationships

	Type of Relationship		
	Social	Sexual	Social/Sexual After Termination
Therapist & Client			
n	16	17	18
%	21.33	22.67	24.00
Teacher & Student			
n	10	11	9
%	13.33	14.67	12.00
Supervisor & Supervisee			
n	10	10	10
%	13.33	13.33	13.33

Note: The percentage reflects those out of the entire sample of 75 who indicated training received in these categories.

TABLE 6

Training Received Regarding Erotic Transference and Countertransference

Training Received as:	n	%
	Transference	
Student	34	45.30
Intern	33	44.00
Staff	27	36.00
	Countertransference	
Student	27	36.00
Intern	27	36.00
Staff	24	32.00

Note: The percentage reflects those out of the entire sample of 75 who indicated training received in these categories.

TABLE 7

Social Relationships Reported

Respondent as:	n	%
Undergraduate with Class Instructor	24	32.00
Graduate student with:		
Class Instructor	34	45.33
Advisor	29	38.67
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	28	37.33
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	15	20.00
Intern with:		
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	25	33.33
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	5	6.67
Counseling Center Staff (not supevisor)	27	36.00
Counseling Center Staff with:		
Student (not supervisee)	27	36.00
Supervisee (practicum)	15	20.00
Supervisee (intern)	20	26.67
Supervisee (post-doctoral)	10	13.33
Higher Status Colleague	29	38.67
Therapy Client	16	21.33
Counseling Center Client with Therapist	9	12.00

Note: n refers to those responding Yes to this question and the percentage is of the total sample of 75.

TABLE 8

Romantic Relationships without Physical Intimacy Reported

Respondent as:	n	%
Undergraduate with Class Instructor	3	4.00
Graduate student with:		
Class Instructor	2	2.67
Advisor	0	0.00
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	2	2.67
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	0	0.00
Intern with:		
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	2	2.67
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	0	0.00
Counseling Center Staff (not supevisor)	3	4.00
Counseling Center Staff with:		
Student (not supervisee)	2	2.67
Supervisee (practicum)	1	1.33
Supervisee (intern)	1	1.33
Supervisee (post-doctoral)	1	1.33
Higher Status Colleague	5	6.67
Therapy Client	3	4.00
Counseling Center Client with Therapist	1	1.33

Note: n refers to those responding Yes to this question and the percentage is of the total sample of 75.

TABLE 9

Erotic Touching Reported

Respondent as:	n	%
Undergraduate with Class Instructor	4	5.33
Graduate student with:		
Class Instructor	4	5.33
Advisor	1	1.33
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	2	2.67
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	0	0.00
Intern with:		
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	2	2.67
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	1	1.33
Counseling Center Staff (not supevisor)	2	2.67
Counseling Center Staff with:		
Student (not supervisee)	4	5.33
Supervisee (practicum)	1	1.33
Supervisee (intern)	1	1.33
Supervisee (post-doctoral)	0	0.00
Higher Status Colleague	4	5.33
Therapy Client	4	5.33
Counseling Center Client with Therapist	2	2.67

Note: n refers to those responding Yes to this question and the percentage is of the total sample of 75.

TABLE 10

Sexual Intercourse Reported

Respondent as:	n	%
Undergraduate with Class Instructor	1	1.33
Graduate student with:		
Class Instructor	2	2.67
Advisor	1	1.33
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	1	1.33
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	0	0.00
Intern with:		
Therapy Supervisor (Counseling Center)	0	0.00
Therapy Supervisor (other setting)	0	0.00
Counseling Center Staff (not supevisor)	0	0.00
Counseling Center Staff with:		
Student (not supervisee)	2	2.67
Supervisee (practicum)	0	0.00
Supervisee (intern)	0	0.00
Supervisee (post-doctoral)	0	0.00
Higher Status Colleague	3	4.00
Therapy Client	2	2.67
Counseling Center Client with Therapist	2	2.67

Note: n refers to those responding Yes to this question and the percentage is of the total sample of 75.

SEXUAL INTIMACY IN TRAINING AND PRACTICE:

SETTING LIMITS FOR COUNSELORS, PSYCHOLOGISTS AND EDUCATORS

There are many ways in which we may set limits as practitioners in counseling and psychological services. Social, romantic or sexual relationships between therapist and client or between educator and student have been studied using surveys of populations of psychiatrists and psychologists but none have focused on the college or university counseling center environment. The purpose of this survey is to obtain information concerning the experiences of those who work and/or train in the college counseling center. Results will be disseminated in the Commission VII Newsletter with special attention to needs for training and staff development programming.

A high return rate will increase the usefulness and generalizability of these data. Please return the survey even if you have not had the experiences listed. If you choose not to complete the survey please return the blank survey. If you choose not to complete the survey, it would be very helpful to have a statement from you giving your reasons for that choice.

Your responses to this survey will be completely anonymous and confidential. Only group data will be reported. Please do not include any identifying information on the survey. Completion of the survey constitutes your consent to participate. Return the survey as soon as possible to:

Elizabeth Yarris, Ph.D.
Commission VII Survey
Counseling and Career Development Center
320 Student Services Building
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

1. Gender (circle): M F
2. Degree: _____
3. Licensed or certified (circle): Yes No
4. Age: _____
5. Field: _____
6. Counseling Center Experience (please check all that apply):

	Past	# months	Year of termination	Present	# months
Practicum student					
Intern					
Staff Member					
Administrator					
Client					

7. As a student I received training in the legal and ethical issues of (please check all that apply by marking an "S"):

	Social Relationships	Sexual Relationships	Social/Sexual Relationships after the termination of the professional relationship
Therapist & client			
Teacher & student			
Supervisor & supervisee			

8. Please note in the spaces in question 7. if you received this training as an intern (I) and as a counseling center staff member (C).
9. I received training in how to handle issues of erotic transference as (please check all that apply): ___a student ___an intern ___a staff member
10. I received training in how to handle issues of erotic countertransference as: ___a student ___an intern ___a staff member
11. Other comments on your training in issues of sexual intimacy between therapist and client or educator and student:

12. Please fill in the following grid using this code system: Y=yes N=no W=wanted U=unwanted D=during the professional relationship T=after termination

Please record the number of times the experience occurred in each category. C=sought consultation for the experience

You as:	Involved with:	Type of Relationship: Social	Romantic without physical intimacy	Non-erotic touching	Erotic touching	Sexual intercourse
Counseling center client	therapist					
Undergraduate	class instructor					
Graduate student	class instructor					
Graduate student	advisor					
Graduate student	therapy supervisor(in counseling center)					
Graduate student	therapy supervisor (other settings)					
Intern	therapy supervisor (counseling center)					
Intern	therapy supervisor (other settings)					
Intern	counseling center staff (not supervisor)					
Counseling center staff	therapy client					
Counseling center staff	supervisee(practicum student)					
Counseling center staff	supervisee (intern)					
Counseling center staff	supervisee (post-doctoral)					
Counseling center staff	student (not client or supervisee)					
Counseling center staff	colleague with more power/status					

13. If you have had any of the above experiences, please comment on your perception of the experience at the time it happened compared to your perception of the experience at this time:

14. If you have had any of the above experiences, please comment on your perception of benefits or damages to those involved:

15. If you have had any of the above experiences, please comment on the type of consultation which you sought and how the consultation was or was not helpful. If you did not seek consultation, please indicate why not:

16. Other comments:

Thank you for your participation. If this survey has caused you any discomfort or raised questions about therapist/client or educator/student relationships, please seek consultation. This may be done with a colleague or supervisor, with legal and ethical professional or state organizations or at your college affirmative action office. If you have any questions about this survey please contact Elizabeth Yarris at (419) 372-2081.